

by the Legislative Council, be taken into consideration."

Sir, Article 119 of the Constitution requires that provision be made by an Act of the State Legislature concerned for prohibiting simultaneous membership of both Houses of Legislature in those States where the Legislature consists of two Houses. Previously in the State of Mysore, Act 33 of 1951 made this provision. That Act is no longer applicable to the new Legislature of the new State of Mysore and accordingly this Bill has been brought forward. The Bill makes provision for two cases. The first is, where a member seeks election to the Legislative Assembly of the State as well as the Legislative Council of the State and has not taken his seat in either House, he has to elect which seat he will retain. The other case for which provision is made is, where a member who is already a member of one of the Houses and seeks election to the other House his seat in the other House will be deemed to have been vacated. To this end, this legal provision has been made. I commend the Bill for the acceptance of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That the Mysore Legislature (Prohibition of Simultaneous Membership) Bill, 1956, as passed by the Legislative Council, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now the Bill would be read clause by clause. As there are no amendments I will put clauses 1, 2, 3 and 4, the title and preamble to the House.

The question is :

"That clauses 2, 3, 4 and 1, and the Title and the Preamble stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 2, 3, 4 and 1 and the Title and the Preamble were added to the Bill.

Motion to pass.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—I move :

"That the Mysore Legislature (Prohibition of Simultaneous Membership) Bill, 1956, as passed by the Legislative Council, be passed."

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Question is :

"That the Mysore Legislature (Prohibition of Simultaneous Membership) Bill, 1956, as passed by the Legislative Council, be passed."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Bill is passed.

HYDERABAD AGRICULTURAL DEBTORS RELIEF (MYSORE AMENDMENT) BILL, 1956.

5-30 P.M.

*Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK (Minister for Co-operation) :—Sir, I beg to move.

"That the Hyderabad Agricultural Debtors Relief (Mysore Amendment) Bill, 1956, as passed by the Legislative Council, be taken into consideration."

In this connection, I would like to submit a few words for the consideration of the House. This Bill was passed by the Hyderabad Legislature and came into force on 5-10-1956. Under sub-section (1) of Section IV the creditors and debtors were given an opportunity to file their applications before courts within three months from the date. But unfortunately that Government did not take action to frame rules and bye-laws that had to be framed thereunder. The Act having been brought into force, there were no rules and bye-laws. Nor did the assent of the President for the Act was obtained. It therefore necessitated this Government to bring this measure to regularise the Act and also take power to frame rules and bye-laws. Hence the amendment to the section.

In the original sub-section, there was a provision to make necessary applications within three months from the

(SRI A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.)

date of the passing of the Act. But since no rules and bye-laws have been made, provision has been made now that the date prescribed by Government to be notified in the Gazette will be the date by which they should file their applications before the court.

This is a very useful measure for the relief of the creditors as well as the debtors. I hope this House will give its consent.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved :

“That the Hyderabad Agricultural Debtors Relief (Mysore Amendment) Bill, 1956, as passed by the Legislative Council be taken into consideration.”

*SRI S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR (T.-Narasipur).—Sir, I beg to place my views before this House in respect of the amendment. The original Act or the parent Act had a definite period specified, three months from the commencement of the Act. I now understand from the Hon'ble Minister that it was passed in the month of October and no rules were framed and the States Reorganisation has taken place and therefore the relief that was intended in the Act could not be extended or could not be availed of both by the creditors and debtors. I would like to know what prevented them from specifying the period, instead of taking the power to themselves. By this amendment, we are going to give the Government a free handle to frame the rules any time and keep the whole thing in suspense. We have a very bitter experience in respect of such things in the previous Mysore Government. Enactments were passed and rules were not framed for years together. Such things should not happen. I would urge the Government to specify the period so that they can hasten the formation of rules and extend the relief to the concerned parties.

Therefore I insist on this condition that instead of asking for wide power, let the Government limit the time.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—Sir, if the Government were not anxious to push through this as early as possible, we would not have brought this amendment in this Session. The intention of the Government is to push through this legislation as early as possible and no date can be specified because no rules are framed. We must also wait for the receipt of the Assent of the President. We cannot simply mention some particular date. We must receive the Assent and then we must fix the date. Therefore, it is not in our hands to fix the date right now. As I submitted, we have to get the Assent of the President. We have also to frame the rules and bye-laws. Hence this power has been taken by that Government. As soon as the Assent is received, I assure the Hon'ble Member that this Government will not delay even for a day to fix the proper time.

With this assurance, I hope my friend will give his consent.

Sri L. K. SHROFF (Raichur).—Sir, as a Member coming from the former Hyderabad Legislative Assembly . . .

SRI N. B. PUJAR (Ron).—On a point of order, Sir. After the Hon'ble Minister has spoken in reply, whether it is open to any Hon'ble Member to offer his remarks ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—I thought the Hon'ble Member, Sri Shroff, was going to raise a point of order. It now appears that he is going to make a speech. A speech cannot be entertained after the reply from the Hon'ble Minister.

Sri L. K. SHROFF.—Was it in the nature of a reply, Sir ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Naturally, when the mover of the motion rises to make a speech for a second time, it must be taken as reply.

I will now put the Bill to the vote. The question is :

“That the Hyderabad Agricultural Debtors Relief (Mysore Amendment) Bill, 1956, as passed by the Legislative Council, be taken into consideration.”

The motion was adopted.

As there are no amendments, I will put all the clauses.

The question is :

“That clauses 2 and 1 and the Title and the Preamble stand part of the Bill.

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 2 and 1 and Title and the Preamble were added to the Bill.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—Sir, I move :

“That the Hyderabad Agricultural Debtors Relief (Mysore Amendment) Bill, 1956, as passed by the Legislative Council, be passed.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

“That the Hyderabad Agricultural Debtors Relief (Mysore Amendment) Bill, 1956, as passed by the Legislative Council, be passed.”

The motion was adopted.

CITY OF BANGALORE MUNICIPAL CORPORATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1956.

*Sri R. CHENNIGARAMIAH (Minister for Local Self-Government).—Sir, I beg to move :

“That the City of Bangalore Municipal Corporation (Amendment) Bill, 1956, as passed by the Legislative Council be taken into consideration.”

Mr. Speaker, Sir, this is a very simple amendment brought before this House. It does not require a very long speech. In this connection, I would like to make a few remarks. In 1949 this Municipal Corporation Act came into being. The City of Bangalore was divided into 50 divisions. Each division constituted a single-member constituency and the voters' list was prepared on the basis of the then existing population in each constituency. Now, in the year 1956, it was found out that the population in some of the divisions had enormously increased. This result was that the strength of the voters in

some constituencies rose from 2,000 to 17,000. It is therefore the duty of the responsible Government to see that the strength of the voters in every constituency is more or less the same. We have no objection to allow a variation of 10 per cent. But the population varied for the last few years, from 1949 to 1956, and the strength of the voters also was varying. So, it was thought desirable to change the divisions and to prepare voters list on the basis of the population.

Since the Houses of Legislature were not in session, Government considered it desirable to extend the term by an ordinance and this Bill has not been placed before this for your kind acceptance.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The motion is :

That the City of Bangalore Municipal Corporation (Amendment) Bill, 1956, as passed by the Legislative Council be taken into consideration.

*ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ (ತಾರುವೇಕರೆ).—ನಾನು ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಎರೋದಿಸಲು ಏಳಬೇಕಾಗಿ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಇದು ನಮ್ಮ ದುರದೃಷ್ಟಿ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಮಂಡಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಧೈರ್ಯವಿರಲಾರದೆಂದು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಅವರು ಧೈರ್ಯದಿಂದ ಮಂಡಿಸಿ ಇದನ್ನು ಸಮರ್ಥಿಸಿ ಎರಡುಮಾತನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಇದು ನಮಗೆ ಮಾಮೂಲಾಗಿ ಬಿಟ್ಟಿದೆ. ಸ್ಥಳೀಯ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾದರೆಯೇ ಬಹಳವಾಗಿ ಅನುಮಾನ ಪಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದ ಈ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಆ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಚಲಾಯಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇದ್ದ ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ತಪ್ಪಿಸಿರುವುದು ಬಹಳ ವಿಷಾದಕರವಾಗಿದೆ. ಯಾವುದೇ ಅಧಿಕಾರವಾಗಲಿ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವ ತತ್ವದಮೇಲೆ ಪ್ರಾಪ್ತವಾದಾಗ ಆದಳಿತ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ನಡೆಸಿದೆಯೇ, ಇಲ್ಲವೇ ಎಂದು ಜನತೆಗೆ ನೋಟಿಸಲು ಒಂದು ವಾಯಿದೆಯಿದೆ. ಒಂದುಸಾರಿ ಚುನಾವಣೆಯಾದ ಮೇಲೆ ಮೂರುವರ್ಷ ಪ್ರಜೆಗಳು ಆದಳಿತ ನಡೆಯುವುದನ್ನು ನೋಡುತ್ತಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅದು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ನಡೆಯಿತೇ, ಇಲ್ಲವೇ ಎಂದು ನೋಡಿ ಒಂದು ಡೈರೆಕ್ಷನ್ ಕೊಡಲು ಚುನಾವಣೆ ನಡೆಯಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಅಂಥ ಚುನಾವಣೆಯನ್ನು ನಡೆಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಡ್ಡಿಬರುವ ಅಂಥದಕ್ಕೂ ಕೂಡ ಆರ್ಡಿನೆನ್ಸ್ ರಕ್ಷಣೆ ಪಡೆಯುವ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಒಂದು ಘಂಟೆ ಕೂಡ ಆದಳಿತ ನಡೆಸಲು ರಾಯಬ್ಬಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಕಾರಣ ಇಷ್ಟು ಒಟ್ಟುಗಳ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಯಿತೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಅರೋಗ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಬರ್ತ್ ಕಂಟ್ರೋಲಿಗೆ ಜಾಗೃತ ಏರ್ಪಾಡುಮಾಡಲಿಲ್ಲ, ಅದು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ತಪ್ಪು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಕೇವಲ ಜನಾಂಗವು ಅಲ್ಪಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿದ ಮಾತ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ಕಾನೂನು ತರಬೇಕಾಯಿತೆಂದು ಹೇಳತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಯಾರೂ ಒಪ್ಪತಕ್ಕ